

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-24 were originally pending. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. No claims have been added, canceled, or withdrawn. Thus, claims 1-24 remain pending. At least for the reasons discussed below, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections to the pending claims is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Amendments**

Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. These claim amendments are made to impart precision to the claims (e.g., by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art), and thereby, expedite the prosecution of this matter. For example, the preamble of claim 1 has been amended to more particularly show that operations associated with claim 1 are implemented at least in part by a computer. More specifically, the preamble of claim 1 was amended to change "[a] method for enumerating applications" to "[a] method implemented at least in part by a computing device for enumerating applications". Additionally, claim 5 was amended to correct a grammatical error. More specifically, claim 5 was amended to change "responsive receiving the discovery response" to "responsive to receiving the discovery response".

### **35 USC §102(e) Rejections**

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent application publication number 2003/0217166 to Dal Canto. This rejection is traversed.

A fundamental aspect of 35 USC §102(e) is that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is described in a single prior art

1 reference (MPEP §2131.01). Dal Canto does not describe each and every feature  
2 of claims 1-24 for the following reasons.

3 **Claim 1** recites “sending a remote application discovery request to a Web  
4 service, the Web service being deployed on a remote applications publication  
5 (RAP) Web server in the Intranet, the remote application discovery request being  
6 sent to the Web service by the remote client computer via a public network  
7 coupling the remote client computer to the Web server”, and “responsive to the  
8 sending, receiving a discovery response from the Web service, the discovery  
9 response identifying at least one application installed on the Intranet for terminal  
10 server (TS) based access by a user of the remote client computer.” The Action  
11 asserts that these recited features are disclosed at paragraphs 47, 48 and 49 of Dal  
12 Canto. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

13 Paragraphs 47, 48, and 49 of Dal Canto disclose that a remote  
14 authentication service module **210** (Fig. 1), which is a component of a network  
15 operations center (NOC) **200**, “establishes a secure device connection” between  
16 the NOC and “the requesting client device **400** to display the client-specific  
17 customized Meta-Desktop on the requesting client device 400” ([0048]). The user  
18 interface presents icons representing various services that are not implemented by  
19 the NOC, but instead are implemented by one or more servers **330** on a remote  
20 service center **300**. The Meta-Desktop generated by the NOC and sent by the  
21 NOC to the client, allows a user of the client device **400** to select a service of  
22 interest, obtain a service connection with a service center **300** that runs the  
23 selected service, and receive rendering commands for client **400** to “display  
24 human perceptible output” ([0042] and [0052]) of the selected service. Dal Canto  
25 at [0041] expressly discloses that these rendering commands are not “data”

1 associated with the selected service because “the data never exits the service  
2 center 300. [...] With the service provisioning system architecture 100, businesses  
3 and corporations no longer need to purchase and maintain desktop or laptops,  
4 provide technical and software support at the individual client device location.”  
5 These teachings do not describe each and every feature of claim 1 for at least the  
6 following reasons.

7 The cited portion of Dal Canto, and Dal Canto as a whole, does not disclose  
8 “sending a remote application discovery request to a Web service” or “receiving a  
9 discovery response”, as claim 1 recites. Instead, the only requests and responses  
10 disclosed by Dal Canto are *device and user authentication requests* sent by the  
11 client device 400 to the NOC 200. More particularly, Dal Canto at [0043] through  
12 [0046] expressly describes that a client device 400 sends an authentication request  
13 to a network operations center 200 (NOC) as part of operations to establish secure  
14 communications with the NOC. Dal Canto at [0055] expressly describes that  
15 these request/response communications are “public key transactions” to  
16 authenticate the client device 400 and a corresponding user. Clearly, an  
17 authentication request of Dal Canto is not “a remote application discovery  
18 request”, as claim 1 recites. Moreover, it is plain that these NOC’s authentication  
19 operations are not a “Web service being deployed on a remote applications  
20 publication (RAP) Web server” as claim 1 recites.

21 With respect to Dal Canto’s service center 300, Dal Canto expressly  
22 discloses at [0051] that “no client devices 400 can call into or initiate connections  
23 to the service center 300”. Instead, when a user of a client device 400 selects a  
24 service from the NOC 200 provided Meta-Desktop, the NOC 200 uses the  
25 established secure connection to establish a new “*device or render connection*”

1 between a server 330 at the service center 300 and the client device 400. Dal  
2 Canto describes at [0052] that after “the NOC 200 initiates the establishment of a  
3 session between a particular service center 300 and the client device 400, the  
4 requesting client device 400 transmits *user inputs* to the appropriate service center  
5 300” (emphasis added). And, “[t]he service center 300 transmits the *rendering*  
6 *commands* [i.e., over the “render connection”] to the client device 400” (emphasis  
7 added).

8 Dal Canto at [0058] indicates that digital data received from the client  
9 device 400 is keystroke and/or mouse inputs. At [0042] Dal Canto discloses that  
10 the client device 400 merely receives and displays “human perceptible output” of a  
11 service and that a client transmits “basic, atomic inputs” to the service. Clearly,  
12 these “user inputs” and “basic, atomic inputs” respectively communicated between  
13 a client device 400 to a service center 300 do not disclose “a remote application  
14 discovery request”, as claim 1 recites. Moreover, it is plain that the “rendering  
15 commands” sent to the client device 400 by the service center 300 responsive to  
16 receipts of the client device transmitted user inputs do not disclose “responsive to  
17 the sending, receiving a discovery response”, as claim 1 recites. For at least these  
18 reasons, Dal Canto does not describe each and every element as set forth in  
19 claim 1.

20 Additionally, the authentication responses sent to the client 400 by the  
21 NOC 200 of Dal Canto, and the “rendering commands” sent to the client 400 by  
22 the service center 300 do not disclose that anything “identify[ies] at least one  
23 application installed on the Intranet for terminal server (TS) based access by a user  
24 of the remote client computer”, as claim 1 recites. For a user of a client device to  
25 engage in “terminal server (TS) based access by a user of the remote client

1 computer”, terminal server support applications and/or hardware will necessarily  
2 be present on the “remote client computer”. Otherwise, the user will not be able to  
3 engage in “terminal server (TS) based access by a user of the remote client  
4 computer”, as claim 1 recites. In contrast to these necessarily present aspects, Dal  
5 Canto’s client device **400** may never include such terminal service application  
6 support or hardware. More particularly, Dal Canto at [0017] expressly discloses a  
7 system that “allows delivery of any digital service to a remote location without  
8 requiring a local copy of the data, any application, or supportive hardware.”

9 Moreover, Dal Canto at [0041] expressly discloses that these rendering  
10 commands are not “data” associated with the selected service because “the data  
11 never exits the service center **300**. [...] With the service provisioning system  
12 architecture **100**, businesses and corporations *no longer need to purchase and*  
13 *maintain desktop or laptops, provide technical and software support at the*  
14 *individual client device location*” (emphasis added) Thus, Dal Canto’s client  
15 device **400** may never be able to engage in a terminal services session with any  
16 service or application installed on a service center **300**.

17 Applicant respectfully submits that Dal Canto purposefully designed the  
18 client device **400** to be completely independent of “terminal server (TS) based  
19 access”, as claim 1 recites, because Dal Canto at [0012] expressly discloses that  
20 such terminal server based client device access is problematic. More specifically,  
21 “WTS [WINDOWS Terminal Services] software impose considerable processing  
22 load on the client PC, and are vulnerable to network faults and security breaches,  
23 such as “man-in-the-middle” attacks.” Thus, a system of Dal Canto may never  
24 “responsive to the sending, receiving a discovery response from the Web service”,  
25 “the discovery response identifying at least one application installed on the

1 Intranet for terminal server (TS) based access by a user of the remote client  
2 computer”, as claim 1 recites.

3 For these additional reasons, Dal Canto does not describe each and every  
4 element as set forth in claim 1. Since Dal Canto does not describe each and every  
5 element as set forth in claim 1, Dal Canto cannot anticipate claim 1. Accordingly,  
6 the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claim 1 as anticipated by Dal Canto is improper  
7 and should be withdrawn.

8 **Claims 2-6** depend from claim 1 and are allowable over Dal Canto solely  
9 by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of  
10 claims 2-6 should be withdrawn.

11 Additionally, claims 2-6 further include features that are not expressly or  
12 inherently described by Dal Canto.

13 For example, claim 2 recites “wherein the sending and receiving are  
14 independent of a Virtual Private Network connection between the remote client  
15 computer and the Intranet.” In addressing these claimed features, the Action  
16 asserts they are disclosed by Dal Canto at paragraphs 10 and 14. Applicant  
17 respectfully disagrees. Although Dal Canto describes at paragraph 10 that a VPN  
18 connection requires expensive VPN termination equipment and client software,  
19 Dal Canto at paragraph [0035] expressly discloses that the preferred  
20 implementation to ensure user authentication “preferably comprises a virtual  
21 private network [VPN] surface to segregate data traffic and to provide a high level  
22 of network performance.” Thus, a system of Dal Canto does not anticipate  
23 “wherein the sending and receiving are independent of a Virtual Private Network  
24 connection between the remote client computer and the Intranet”, as claim 2  
25 recites.

1 For this additional reason, the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claim 2 as  
2 anticipated by Dal Canto is improper and should be withdrawn.

3 In another example, claim 4 recites “wherein the at least one application is  
4 multiple applications, respective ones of the multiple applications having been  
5 published by multiple information sources on the Intranet, the multiple  
6 information sources comprising one or more of a directory service, a Systems  
7 Management Server (SMS), and an office computer associated with the user.” In  
8 addressing these claimed features, the Action asserts they are disclosed by Dal  
9 Canto at paragraph 40. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

10 Paragraph 40 of Dal Canto is completely silent on any disclosure with  
11 respect to “a directory service, a System Management Server (SMS)”, as claim 4  
12 recites. Instead, paragraph 40 merely indicates that a service center 300 may  
13 support a given service “such as video conference, Internet protocol (IP)  
14 telephony, voice messaging, cable television, digital music, digital movie,  
15 e-commerce, etc.” by wrapping existing native protocols within an appropriate  
16 remote interactive protocol. Clearly, nowhere do these teachings expressly  
17 disclose or indicate as necessarily present the claimed “the multiple information  
18 sources comprising one or more of a directory service, a Systems Management  
19 Server (SMS), and an office computer associated with the user”, as claim 4 recites.

20 For at least these additional reasons, the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claim  
21 4 is improper and should be withdrawn.

22 In another example, claim 5 recites “wherein responsive to receiving the  
23 discovery response from the Web service, the remote client computer presents  
24 respective shortcuts to the user, each shortcut corresponding to an individual one  
25 of remote applications identified in the discovery response, each shortcut being

1 selectable by the user to invoke a terminal service, the terminal service executing a  
2 corresponding remote application on an associated installation point on the  
3 Intranet.” In addressing these claimed features, the Action asserts that they are  
4 disclosed by Dal Canto at paragraphs 49 and 51. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

5 Dal Canto at paragraph 49 merely discloses that a “Meta-Desktop” presents  
6 icons representing various services available to a user of a client device. Nowhere  
7 do these teachings of paragraph 49 disclose that any such available service is  
8 “selectable by the user to invoke a terminal service”, as claim 5 recites. As  
9 already discussed, Dal Canto at [0041] expressly describes that “[w]ith the service  
10 provisioning system architecture **100**, businesses and corporations no longer need  
11 to purchase and maintain desktop or laptops, provide technical and software  
12 support at the individual client device location.” Applicant respectfully submits  
13 that if there is no software support for terminal services at Dal Canto's client  
14 device **400**, a user of the client device 400 will not be able to engage in a terminal  
15 service session involving any service or application installed on a service center  
16 **300**. This is in accordance with the disclosure of Dal Canto. Dal Canto at [0012]  
17 expressly discloses that terminal server based client device access is problematic  
18 and that the system of Dal Canto is independent of the ability of any user of a  
19 client device **400** to engage in terminal services or the need for any entity to invest  
20 in the hardware/software infrastructure needed to implement terminal services  
21 between a server and a client. For at least these reasons, these teachings of [0049]  
22 are completely silent with respect to the recited features of claim 5.

23 With respect to paragraph [0051], Dal Canto merely discloses that once a  
24 user selects a particular service, an NOC **200** independent of a service center **300**  
25 that implements the selected service uses an already established secure connection



1 with the client device 400 to open a render connection between the client device  
2 and the service center 300. The service center 300 uses the render connection to  
3 convert “format (resolution, color depth, keystrokes, mouse cord etc.) appropriate  
4 for each client device 400 for any of the digital services available on the service  
5 center 300.” Clearly, this cited disclosure of Dal Canto is completely silent with  
6 respect to “wherein responsive to receiving the discovery response from the Web  
7 service, the remote client computer presents respective shortcuts to the user, each  
8 shortcut corresponding to an individual one of remote applications identified in the  
9 discovery response, each shortcut being selectable by the user to invoke a terminal  
10 service, the terminal service executing a corresponding remote application on an  
11 associated installation point on the Intranet”, as claim 5 recites.

12 For each of these additional reasons, withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e)  
13 rejection of claim 5 is respectfully requested.

14 **Claim 7** recites “sending a remote application discovery request to a Web  
15 service, the Web service being deployed on a remote applications publication  
16 (RAP) Web server in the Intranet, the remote application discovery request being  
17 sent to the Web service by the remote client computer via a public network  
18 coupling the remote client computer to the Web server”, and “responsive to the  
19 sending, receiving a discovery response from the Web service, the discovery  
20 response identifying at least one application installed on the Intranet for terminal  
21 server (TS) based access by a user of the remote client computer.” For the reasons  
22 already discussed above with respect to claim 1, Dal Canto does not anticipate  
23 these recited features of claim 7.

24 Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claim 7 as anticipated by Dal  
25 Canto is improper and should be withdrawn.

1       **Claims 8-12** depend from claim 7 and are allowable over Dal Canto solely  
2 by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, and at least for these reasons, the 35  
3 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 8-12 should be withdrawn.

4       Additionally, for the reasons already discussed above with respect to claims  
5 2 and 4-5, respective ones of claims 8, 10, and 11 recite additional features that are  
6 not anticipated by Dal Canto. For those additional reasons the 35 USC 102(e)  
7 rejection of claims 8, 10, and 11 should be withdrawn.

8       **Claims 13** recites "sending a remote application discovery request to a  
9 Web service, the Web service being deployed on a remote applications publication  
10 (RAP) Web server in the Intranet, the remote application discovery request being  
11 sent to the Web service by the remote client computer via a public network  
12 coupling the remote client computer to the Web server", and "responsive to the  
13 sending, receiving a discovery response from the Web service, the discovery  
14 response identifying at least one application installed on the Intranet for terminal  
15 server (TS) based access by a user of the remote client computer." For the reasons  
16 already discussed above with respect to claim 1, Dal Canto does not anticipate  
17 these recited features of claim 13.

18       Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claim 13 as anticipated by Dal  
19 Canto is improper and should be withdrawn.

20       **Claims 14-18** depend from claim 13 and are allowable over Dal Canto  
21 solely by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, and at least for these reasons,  
22 the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 14-18 should be withdrawn.

23       Additionally, for the reasons already discussed with respect to claims 2, 4,  
24 and 5, the additional features recited by claims 14, 16, and 17 are not anticipated  
25 by Dal Canto.

1 For these additional reasons the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claims 14, 16,  
2 and 17 should be withdrawn.

3 **Claim 19** recites “means for sending a remote application discovery request  
4 to a Web service, the Web service being deployed on a remote applications  
5 publication (RAP) Web server in the Intranet, the remote application discovery  
6 request being sent to the Web service by the remote client computer via a public  
7 network coupling the remote client computer to the Web server”, and “means for  
8 responsive to the sending, receiving a discovery response from the Web service,  
9 the discovery response identifying at least one application installed on the Intranet  
10 for terminal server (TS) based access by a user of the remote client computer.”  
11 For the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, Dal Canto does  
12 not anticipate these recited features of claim 19.

13 Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claim 19 as anticipated by Dal  
14 Canto is improper and should be withdrawn.

15 **Claims 20-24** depend from claim 19 and are allowable over Dal Canto  
16 solely by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, and at least for these reasons,  
17 the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 20-24 should be withdrawn.

18 Additionally, for the reasons described above with respect to claims 2, 4,  
19 and 5, the additional features of claims 20, 22, and 23 are not anticipated by Dal  
20 Canto.

21 For these additional reasons the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claims 20, 22,  
22 and 23 should be withdrawn.

1 Conclusion

2 Pending claims 1-24 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully  
3 requests action to this end. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the  
4 application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance  
5 of a subsequent Office action.  
6

7 Respectfully Submitted,

8  
9 Dated: 12/19/2005

By: Brian Hart

Brian G. Hart  
Reg. No. 44,421  
(509) 324-9256